

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/929,708	08/13/2001	Hirohiko Nishiki	SLA 0536	8902
7590 08/19/2004			EXAMINER	
David C. Ripma			SEFER, AHMED N	
Patent Counsel Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
5750 NW Pacific Rim Boulevard			2826	
Camas, WA	98607	•	DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

OX	OX	
----	----	--

			OX				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/929,708	NISHIKI, HIROHIKO)				
•	Examiner	Art Unit					
	A. Sefer	2826					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applica 1) a timely filed amendment whice al (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to á tion in				
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	<i>-</i> //					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Th fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date o (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Of	e date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amo f the shortened statutory period for reply	R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or				
timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant	CFR 1.704(b).		,				
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:						
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment				
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		idered but does NO	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were	e newly				
	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:						
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 20-31.							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						

10. Other: ____

Continuation of 5: Applicant's arguments were not found persuasive enough to overcome the prima facia obviousness established in the previous Office Action. Particularly, the arguments failed to address the fact that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., forming trenches in rigid support substrate) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Furthermore, applicant's arguments in regards to rejection of claims 1, 4, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph were non-responsive.